

United States Fatent and Trademark Office

NATED STATES

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 2023 | www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/785,152	02/16/2001	John Michael Friel	6258-0070	5002	
75	90 12/19/2001				
Margaret B. Kelley, Esq.			EXAMINER		
Clifford Chance Rogers & Wells LLP 200 Park Avenue New York, NY 10166-0153			SANDERS, KRIELL	SANDERS, KRIELLION ANTIONETTE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1714	6	
			DATE MAILED: 12/19/2001		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

MF-G

Application No.

09/785,152

Applicant(s)

Friel et al

Office Action Summary

Examiner

Kriellion Sanders

Art Unit 1714

The MAILING DATE of this communication appears of	on the cover sheet with the correspondence address			
Period for Reply				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.				
 Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communical. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, 	ition.			
nommunication	eriod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any			
Status				
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	•			
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) 💢 This action	on is non-final.			
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims	•			
4) X Claim(s) 1-51	is/are pending in the application.			
4a) Of the above, claim(s)	is/are withdrawn from consideration.			
5) Claim(s)	is/are allowed.			
6) X Claim(s) 1-51	is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s)	e e de la companya de			
8) Claims	L'acceptable and les election requirement			
Application Papers				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.				
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are	objected to by the Examiner.			
11) The proposed drawing correction filed on				
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exami				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
13) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).				
a) All b) Some* c) None of:				
1. Certified copies of the priority documents hav	e been received.			
2. Certified copies of the priority documents hav	e been received in Application No			
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority de application from the International Bure	au (PC1 Hule 17.2(a)).			
*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the				
14) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic	priority under 35 U.S.C. 8 119(e).			
Attachment(s)				
15) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	18) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s).			
16) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	19) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)			
17) X Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 4, 5 20) Other:				

Application/Control Number: 09/785,152

Art Unit: 1714

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Limitations to a point of sale or point of use do not adequately serve to define the invention, since these limitations define subjective acts. The limitation that the method is controlled by a computer does not define the mechanism therein.

Double Patenting

A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer <u>cannot</u> overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

Application/Control Number: 09/785,152

Art Unit: 1714

4. Claims 1-51 are provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention

as that of claims 1-50 of copending Application No. 09/785,147. This is a provisional double

patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

No anticipatory art has been found. Applicant is reminded of his duty to disclose any art he finds

relevant to the examination of this application.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner

should be directed to K. Sanders whose telephone number is (703) 308-2435.

TRELLION A. SANDERS
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Page 3

ks

December 16, 2001